



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

M-L
UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/037,940	01/04/2002	Tatsuo Nomura	70904/56,872	7762
21874	7590	10/02/2006		EXAMINER
EDWARDS & ANGELL, LLP				GIBBS, HEATHER D
P.O. BOX 55874				
BOSTON, MA 02205			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2625	

DATE MAILED: 10/02/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/037,940	NOMURA ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Heather D. Gibbs	2625

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 07/05/06.
- 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-27 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1-15, 17-21 and 27 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) 16, 22 and 23 is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date: _____ |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>07/05/06</u> | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Amendment

1. The amendment filed on 07/05/2006 has been entered and made of record.

Response to Arguments

2. Applicant's arguments filed have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. Upon further review the Examiner finds a first display section to be taught in Venable (US 6,738,154) in Fig 10 References 420 and 430 teach a first and second display section.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 5-11,15,19-21,24,25/21,25/24, 26-27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Venable (US 6,738,154) in view of Oashi et al (US 5,767,845).

Regarding claim 5, which is representative of claims 20 and 21-26, Venable teaches An image processing apparatus, comprising: a printer unit 34 equipped with a user interface section having a first display section; and a scanner unit 26 equipped with

Art Unit: 2625

a user interface section having a second display section (See Figs 1 and 10; Col 5 Lines 58-64; Col 12 Lines 40-64 Ref 420 and 430).

Venable does not disclose expressly wherein said user interface section of said printer unit and said user interface section of said scanner unit are arranged such that when either one of these user interface sections displays information regarding a processing of image data, the other user interface section is in non-display state.

Oashi discloses, in Col 13 Lines 43-56 and Fig 8, wherein said user interface section of said printer unit and said user interface section of said scanner unit are arranged such that when either one of these user interface sections displays information regarding a processing of image data, the other user interface section is in non-display state.

Venable & Oashi are combinable because they are from the same field of endeavor, image processing apparatus.

At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to combine Oashi with Venable by creating a display data of the screen image.

The suggestion/motivation for doing so would have been to provide a device in which read out of display data is not necessarily a part of the screen image.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Oashi with Venable to obtain the invention as specified in claims 1, 5,20.

For claim 6, which is representative of claims 24 and 27, Venable discloses wherein: said user interface section of said printer unit and said user interface section of

said scanner unit are arranged such that when either one of these user interface sections displays information regarding a processing of image data, the other user interface section is in non-display state. (Fig 10)

For claim 37 which is representative of claim 21, Venable teaches wherein said plurality user interface sections arranged such that information regarding contents of the command entered by said specific user interface section displays least one said other interface section(s). See Fig 10.

For claim 25/21, Venable discloses wherein said plurality of user interface sections are arranged such that input acceptance of said other user interface section(s) than the specific user interface section is validated in response to the operation input entered by said specific user interface section (Figs 1 and 10; Col 5 Lines 58-64; Col 12 Lines 40-64).

Regarding claim 25/24, Venable teaches wherein said plurality of user interface sections are arranged such that in response to the operation input entered by said specific user interface section, input acceptance of said other user interface section(s) than the specific user interface section is validated and input acceptance of the specific user interface section is invalidated (Col 5 Lines 58-64; Col 12 Lines 40-64)

Considering claim 8, Venable discloses wherein in response to a command entered by said user interface section of said scanner unit, said user interface section of said printer unit changes its display state (Col 5 Lines 49-60).

Regarding claim 9, Venable discloses wherein when a command to execute a processing to be performed by said printer unit is entered by said user interface section

of said scanner unit, said user interface section of said printer displays information regarding contents of the command (Col 5 Lines 49-64).

For claim 10, which is representative of claim 19, Venable teaches An image processing apparatus, comprising: an independently operable scanner unit 26 equipped with a display section and a display control section; an independently operable printer unit 34 equipped with a display section and a display control section, wherein said scanner unit and said printer unit are provided as separate members; and said scanner and said printer unit cooperatively control said display sections of said scanner unit and said printer unit such that: in an independent use of said printer display section of said printer unit set effective, and in a combined use of said printer unit and said scanner unit (Fig 1), said display section of said printer unit is set to be effective if a predetermined condition is satisfied, and if not, only said display section of said scanner unit is set to be effective in displaying information regarding the combined use of said printer unit and scanner unit (Fig 10; Col 12 Lines 40-49).

Considering claim 11, Venable teaches wherein said display section of said scanner unit is a large size display unit capable of displaying graphics (Fig 10). Regarding claim 15, Venable discloses an input section for said display section of said scanner unit and an input section for said display section of said printer unit, wherein said display control section of said scanner unit permits an input operation by said input section of said scanner unit when said display section of said scanner unit is effective; and said display control section of said printer unit permits an input operation by said

input section of said printer unit when said display section of said printer unit is effective.
See Fig 10.

5. Claims 13-14,17-18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Venable '154 and Oashi '845 in view of Wood et al (US 6,453,127).

For claim 13, which is representative of claim 17, Venable and Oashi disclose the image-processing device as disclosed above.

Venable and Oashi do not disclose expressly wherein said predetermined condition is that information to be displayed in said printer unit is different from the information regarding the combined use of said printer unit and said scanner unit.

Wood discloses wherein said predetermined condition is that information to be displayed in said printer unit is different from the information regarding the combined use of said printer unit and said scanner unit (Fig 1; Col 3 Line 66-Col 4 Line 7).

Venable, Oashi, & Wood are combinable because they are from the same field of endeavor, image processing apparatus using user interfaces.

At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to combine Venable and Oashi with Wood by utilizing the printer to provide separate information than the printer/scanner.

The suggestion/motivation for doing so would have been to include a display for the printer and one for the scanner and the printer.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Wood with Venable to obtain the invention as specified in claim 13.

For claim 14, which is representative of claim 18, Wood teaches wherein said predetermined condition is that some failure has occurred in said scanner unit or in any other unit to be used in combination with said printer, and said display control section controls said display section of said printer unit to display a state of the failure occurred in said scanner unit or in any other unit (Col 3 Lines 66- Col 4 Line 7).

Allowable Subject Matter

6. Claims 16,22-23 objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.
7. The following is a statement of reasons for the indication of allowable subject matter: With respect to claim 16, allowable the examiner found neither prior art cited in its entirety, nor based on the prior art found any motivation to combine any of the said prior art which teaches wherein said condition is that an input operation is performed by said input section of said printer unit, and said display control section of said printer unit controls said display section of said printer unit controls. Claim 22-23 are allowable the examiner found neither prior art cited in its entirety, nor based on the prior art found any motivation to combine any of the said prior art which teaches an input entering right allowing for acceptance of the operation input is transferred from the specific user interface to said other user interface section(s) than the specific user interface section.

Conclusion

8. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Heather D. Gibbs whose telephone number is 571-272-7404. The examiner can normally be reached on M-Thu 8AM-7PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, David K. Moore can be reached on 571-272-7437. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 2625

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.


Heather D Gibbs
Examiner
Art Unit 2625

hdg



Thomas A.
~~THOMAS A.~~
PRIMARY EXAMINER